

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE CULPEPER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
HELD IN THE BOARD ROOM, LOCATED AT 302 N. MAIN STREET, ON TUESDAY, MAY 2,  
2006.

**Board Members Present:**     **John F. Coates, Chairman**  
   **Steven E. Nixon, Vice-Chairman**  
Larry W. Aylor  
William C. Chase, Jr.  
Sue D. Hansohn  
Brad C. Rosenberger  
Steven L. Walker

**Staff Present:**                     Frank T. Bossio, County Administrator  
J. David Maddox, County Attorney  
Valerie H. Lamb, Finance Director  
John C. Egertson, Planning Director  
Paul Howard, Director of Environmental Services  
Peggy S. Crane, Deputy Clerk

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Coates, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

Mr. Rosenberger led the Board and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA - ADDITIONS AND/OR DELETIONS**

Mr. Frank Bossio, County Administrator, asked that the agenda item on **UPDATE ON JAIL PROPOSAL** be delayed until the June Board meeting so that additional information could be obtained from the State.

Mr. Nixon moved, seconded by Mr. Aylor, to approve the agenda as amended.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the April 4, 2006 regular meetings and March 20, 2006 special called meeting were presented to the Board for approval.

Mr. Chase moved, seconded by Mrs. Hansohn, to approve the minutes as presented.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Bossio, County Administrator, reviewed the following Consent Agenda items with the

Board:

- a. The Board will consider approving a Proclamation in Recognition of Drs. Karl Beier and Peter Godfrey for their services to the community.
- b. The Board will consider approving a Resolution of Appreciation for the Amissville Volunteer Fire and Rescue Department for their recent donation to the Department of Emergency Services.
- c. The Board will consider approving budget amendments for the Department of Human Services for additional funds received from the University of Virginia (\$1,050) and Virginia Head Start Association (\$1,500) in the area of Head Start for a total of \$2,550. Both donations will be used for classroom supplies.
- d. The Board will consider approving a budget amendment for Culpeper Youth Network, which submitted a supplemental request to the State due to increase in caseload and residential facility expenditures for additional funds. State's share received \$81,029 and local share \$48,971 from the General Fund for a total amount of \$130,000.
- e. The Board will consider approving an appropriation of a grant for the Department of Emergency Services from the Virginia Department of Emergency Management, which has received funding from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security in the amount of \$47,500. No local funds required.
- f. The Board will consider approving a budget amendment for the School System for additional state revenue received due to an increase in ADM (average daily membership) in the amount of \$248,796.
- g. The Board will consider approving a budget transfer (\$183,857) and a budget amendment (\$31,650) for the Department of Environmental Services in the category of CIP in the Water & Sewer Fund.
- h. The Board will consider approving a request from the Parks & Recreation Department to submit a grant application in the amount of \$100,100 to the Virginia Outdoor Fund for the Community Sports Complex along with a Resolution of Support. The grant money, if awarded, will be applied to the installation of lights and electric lines on a Little League Baseball Field. (State \$50,500, local \$50,500).

Mr. Nixon moved, seconded by Mr. Chase, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Mr. Chase asked for additional information on item f. regarding State funds for the School System. Mr. Bossio explained that the \$248,796 represented additional State revenue received due to increased average daily membership. Mr. Chase asked whether the funds were

for this past year or the current year. Mr. Bossio replied that the funds represented increases in students listed in the FY 2006 budget.

Mr. Chase called the question.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

## **GENERAL COUNTY BUSINESS**

### **SPECIAL PRESENTATION**

Mr. Coates asked Chief J. B. Carter, Amissville Volunteer Fire Department, to come forward for a special presentation. Mr. Bossio read the following resolution into the record:

#### ***RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR AMISSVILLE VOLUNTEER FIRE AND RESCUE DEPARTMENT, INC.***

**WHEREAS**, the Amissville Volunteer Fire and Rescue Department, Inc., a volunteer agency of Rappahannock County, is called upon to give of its time, effort, monies, and even the lives of its personnel in the pursuit of saving the lives and property of the citizens of Culpeper, Virginia; and

**WHEREAS**, the Amissville Volunteer Fire and Rescue Department, Inc., recognizes the increasing time demands of responsibilities and activities of the Culpeper County Office of Emergency Services response to Emergency Medical Services needs of the Citizens of Culpeper County; and

**WHEREAS**, the Amissville Volunteer Fire and Rescue Department, Inc., in the name of the Amissville Community has generously donated a 1992 Ford Road Rescue Ambulance to the County of Culpeper to serve its citizens in the preservation of life and property; and

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Culpeper County Board of Supervisors, on behalf of the Citizens of Culpeper County, expresses its deepest appreciation to the Amissville Volunteer Fire and Rescue Department, Inc., for its generous donation.

**DONE** this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of May 2006.

By: Larry W. Aylor, Cedar Mountain District  
William C. Chase, Jr., Stevensburg District  
Sue D. Hansohn, Catalpa District  
Steven E. Nixon, West Fairfax District  
Brad C. Rosenberger, Jefferson District  
Steven L. Walker, East Fairfax District

/s/ John F. Coates  
John F. Coates, Chairman  
Culpeper County Board of Supervisors  
Salem District

ATTEST:

Frank T. Bossio, Clerk to the Board

Mr. Coates thanked Chief Carter, on behalf of the Board and citizens of Culpeper County, for the generous gift of an ambulance and for his Company's continued service to the County and its residents. Chief Carter stated that the donation of the ambulance was being passed on to Culpeper County since a new ambulance had been donated to the Amissville

Company. He said they felt it was something they wanted to do because Culpeper County helped them and they would like to continue to be of assistance to its citizens.

### **SPECIAL RECOGNITION**

Mr. Frank Bossio asked Ms. Susanne Taylor, Director of Human Resources; Mrs. Chasity Croson, Benefits Coordinator; and Ms. Sheila Farmer-Dumas, Risk Manager, to come to the podium. He presented them with a Certificate of Achievement from the Virginia Municipal Group Self Insurance Association for timely reporting of all worker compensation claims. He said this achievement had been brought to his attention by Ms. Dumas who worked very closely with the Human Resources Department, and he wanted to make sure Ms. Taylor and Mrs. Croson received the recognition they deserved for their hard work in accomplishing the significant contribution resulting in savings to the County.

Ms. Taylor stated that their ability to report incidents on a timely basis was a direct result of the cooperation provided by all of the County's departments and employees.

### **INTRODUCTION OF NEW EMPLOYEE**

Mr. John Barrett, Parks & Recreation Director, introduced Mr. Mike Skelton, the new Park Superintendent, who would be working at the Community Complex, Stilman Park, and Galbraith-Marshall field, as well as preparing the Lenn property and other sites in the future. He provided background information on Mr. Skelton's education, work experience and specific skills.

Mr. Coates welcomed Mr. Skelton on behalf of the Board and the County.

Mr. Skelton thanked the Board for the opportunity to work with the County parks system, especially the Community Complex and its youth sports activities. He elaborated on his work experience and specific knowledge on turf management.

Mr. Chase asked whether Mr. Skelton would be in charge of the maintenance of the park in Stevensburg. Mr. Skelton assured him that he would be taking care of all of the parks.

### **CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST BY THE TOWN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**

Mr. Bob Yeaman, representing the Town's Industrial Development Authority, informed the Board he was the attorney for the Virginia Baptist Homes, Inc., located in the County. He explained that the Virginia Baptist Homes was a holding corporation for a number of retirement communities in Virginia and, over the years, had borrowed funds to construct these facilities. He said he was seeking approval from the Board to obtain authority to refund some of the existing outstanding bonds. He stated that the bonds were not being issued to build new facilities, but the process was similar to a refinancing of a home, and the IRS Code required approval from the existing jurisdictional body where the bonds were issued to support the facility, i.e., the Culpeper Baptist Retirement Community. He noted that the Town of Culpeper Industrial Development

Authority held a public hearing, approved the refunding, and forwarded a resolution to the Board of Supervisors. He said he was requesting that the Board approve the resolution to grant the Virginia Baptist Homes the right to issue new refunding bonds to replace the bonds that were presently in place. He pointed out that the resolution stated the amount to be borrowed would not exceed \$87.5 million, but he estimated the bonds would be refunded at approximately \$75 million. He stressed there would be no obligation placed on Culpeper County, the Town of Culpeper, or the Culpeper IDA.

Mr. Chase asked for reassurance that the County would have no obligation as result of the Board's approval. Mr. Yeaman reiterated that the County, Town and the IDA were not guaranteeing the bonds, and the purpose of involving the IDA was to make the interest on the bonds tax free, but the law stipulated that the jurisdictions in which the facilities were located must approve the issuance of the refunding bonds.

Mr. Chase moved, seconded by Mr. Aylor, to approve the request.

Mr. Nixon asked whether the refunding of these bonds would reduce the amount of bonds the County could borrow in any one year. Mr. Yeaman assured him the refunding had no effect on the County's capability to obtain bonds, such as bank-approved bonds. He said the refunded bonds were being replaced dollar-for-dollar and would be issued by the Peninsula Ports Authority IDA in the Hampton Roads area.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

**UPDATE ON JAIL PROPOSAL (DELETED)** – Item rescheduled for June.

**THE BOARD WILL CONSIDER A PERCENTAGE FOR THE PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX RELIEF (PPTRA)**

Mr. Bossio explained that each locality was required to prepare a resolution specifying the percentage of personal property tax relief to be applied to qualifying vehicles for tax year 2006. He stated that the tax relief had been capped and a lump sum had been established. He said the percentage was ultimately affected by the number of new vehicles entering the County and the volume had reduced the original 75 percent tax relief percentage to approximately 58 percent. He pointed out that the raise in the personal property taxes, which occurred when the Board adopted the budget, spread that percentage out to the point that there would be no personal property tax relief since the set amount of the cap would be depleted.

Mr. Bossio informed the Board that the resolution set the personal property tax relief at 38 percent based on the number of new vehicles and the increase in the personal property tax from \$2.50 to \$3.50.

Mr. Walker pointed out that the tax relief percentage had been set at 38 percent in the resolution, which was the best estimate at this time. He asked what would happen if that estimate were wrong. Mr. Bossio replied that Mrs. Terry Yowell, Commissioner of the Revenue, was in attendance, and could correct him if he were wrong. He said the estimate was based on a model built by Mrs. Yowell to calculate the estimated assessment and total levy using the projected tax rate, the current vehicle levy, the growth rate, etc., before arriving at 38.91 percent of tax relief. He pointed out that if the percentage were rounded to 39 percent, a penny's worth of tax at \$215,000 would be lost, so it was set at 38 percent for that reason.

Mr. Chase asked whether a vehicle would be taxed on the purchase price or its present value. Mrs. Yowell replied that the *Code of Virginia* required that a nationally recognized pricing guide be used, and she uses the January 1 issue of NADA (National Automobile Dealers Association).

Mr. Nixon moved, seconded by Mrs. Hansohn to adopt the resolution establishing the percentage of relief on personal property tax at 100 percent for vehicles of \$1,000 or less, 38 percent for vehicles at \$1,001 to \$20,000, and no relief for vehicles \$20,001 and over.

Mr. Walker asked whether 38 percent represented a high or low estimate and should the County err on the high side or low side. Mr. Bossio replied that using 38 percent was erring on the side of caution so that the County would receive the money it had predicted and, if not, the County would have to make up the difference from other sources.

Mr. Nixon asked whether an adjustment could be made in the percentage at a later date. Mr. Bossio replied that once the resolution was approved, that percentage would be the rate of tax relief. Mrs. Yowell agreed with Mr. Bossio and explained that the estimate was not an exact science because of the variables used, and she had taken a conservative approach in her model.

Mr. Chase asked whether this was the first year the County had been faced with this situation. Mrs. Yowell replied that the General Assembly determined that beginning in FY 2007, the Commonwealth would remit to each locality a fixed amount of funding based on the \$950 million cap and that amount would be spread among the total number of vehicles.

Mr. Nixon asked for reassurance that 38 percent was the best estimate based on the information that was currently available. Mrs. Yowell stated that was correct.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

**DISCUSSION OF FUTURE CLASSROOMS AT THE GALBREATH-MARSHALL BUILDING**

Mr. Bossio informed the Board that Mr. Paul Howard, Environmental Services Director, would provide a briefing on the progress being made at the Galbreath-Marshall Building to provide additional classroom space.

Mr. Howard reported that for several years, the Buildings and Grounds Committee had been reviewing various alternatives for building classroom additions to the Galbreath-Marshall Building. He said a plan had been developed several years ago for a six-classroom addition to the front of the building; however, recently a different approach had been taken to add a nine-classroom addition to the building. He displayed a preliminary plan and indicated the entrance to the building on the upper level that had already been renovated. He noted the back portion of the building was being considered for a two-story wing to take advantage of the hill. He said the plan would provide six classrooms on the upper level with the rest of the school, the three classrooms currently on the lower level would be finished, and three additional classrooms would be added under the addition. He noted there would be space also for some bathrooms and offices on the lower level. He said the preliminary plan was for architectural review, and staff was working on a site plan for review by the Town's Zoning Office.

Mr. Walker stated that an elevator would be included in the plan to provide accessibility to the entire building. He noted that the lack of an elevator had delayed the renovation of the current three classrooms on the lower level. Mr. Howard stated the elevator would be located at the point where the new addition joined the current building.

Mr. Chase asked who was using the classrooms at the present time. Mr. Howard replied that the Head Start Program was utilizing most of the current space. Mr. Chase inquired whether Head Start would need the additional space. Mr. Howard stated that Mr. Chip Coleman, Director of Human Services, was not present, but he understood there was a waiting list for some of their programs.

Mr. Nixon asked for further information regarding the number and size of the classrooms and whether they could be used to accommodate elementary students as swing space if required. Mr. Howard stated there would be a new nine-classroom addition and three existing classrooms, for a total of 12, and their size would be comparable to the current classrooms. He said there were different criteria for elementary students than for the Head Start four-year-olds. Mr. Nixon asked whether they would be suitable for kindergarten space. Mr. Howard stated he did not know the answer to that question.

Mr. Chase asked how much grant money would be involved in the project. Mr. Howard replied that at this point, he had not factored in any grant money, because he was merely providing an update to the Board prior to further review by the Building and Grounds Committee.

Mrs. Hansohn asked Mr. Walker whether he was aware of any Federal or State funds that would help to offset the cost of this construction. Mr. Walker felt there would certainly be Federal dollars available for the Head Start Program. He noted that both Dr. David A. Cox, Superintendent of Schools, and Dr. Eric Conti, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Instruction and Curriculum, were both present and asked whether they could discuss the possible utilization of space for the kindergarten and/or pre-K programs.

Dr. Conti stated he had not had any discussions on that particular issue. He estimated the size of the classrooms for kindergarten was usually 800 square feet. Mr. Spencer agreed the classrooms were larger than the 200 square-foot classrooms being proposed.

Mr. Walker stated that using the space at Galbreath-Marshall should be considered and asked whether the space requirement was more for kindergarten classes. Mr. Spencer stated that typically a kindergarten class was 30 x 30, but they would consider anything at this point.

Dr. Conti stated the original discussion was for the Schools to obtain more preschool space because of the wait lists for Head Start and some school-based preschool programs, such as Federal Title I and the Virginia Preschool Initiative (VPI) programs. He said these programs were State/local funded based on the composite index for the Virginia preschool. He noted that the School System currently had eight preschool classrooms: Four designated for learning disabled children that were unique and mandated; one Title I preschool program, and three VPI programs. He said that of the four preschool classes, one was already at Galbreath-Marshall, and one each at Sycamore Park, Farmington and Pearl Sample. He noted that two of the preschool classes were currently in existing trailers or learning cottages, and, if the classrooms were moved into Galbraith-Marshall, two classroom spaces in the existing School System could potentially be vacant. He said they looked at the three classroom spaces in the basement at Galbreath-Marshall last year, but without the elevator, they were unavailable. He agreed that any preschool space would be welcomed. He stated that there was a big demand for preschool classrooms as evidenced by the recent, first-time, School System and Head Start joint preregistration of preschool students, and the 12 classrooms at Galbraith-Marshall could be filled easily. He added that he would have to review the regulations for kindergarten space.

Mrs. Hansohn agreed that the regulations for kindergarten should be explored because of savings to be gained by using the Galbreath-Marshall space. Dr. Conti agreed to pursue that issue.



Mr. Walker asked whether the trailer at Farmington could be used for anything other than preschool. Dr. Conti replied that it could potentially be used for some other type of program, such as arts or music, but he was not counting on that space being available.

Mr. Walker asked whether the special education pre-K could be moved. Dr. Conti stated that class could be moved, but it would not be cost effective because of the services provided on-site by the speech pathologists, occupational therapists, and other staff available, and, if the special education students were moved, additional staff would have to be added. He said that move would free up physical space but operational costs would increase. He agreed it was something that could be discussed, but special education students were high-need and required very specialized services.

Mr. Walker asked whether special education students were housed in one of the schools or were located throughout the elementary school system. Dr. Conti replied there were two at Pearl Sample, one at Sycamore Park, and one at Emerald Hills to avoid long bus rides for the learning disabled. He added that there were approximately eight students in each class because of their various needs, and the School System was required to provide services to them from ages two to 21.

Mr. Walker asked whether the classrooms being used for special education were a different size and could not be converted to a typical classroom. Dr. Conti replied that those classrooms could potentially be used by removing some walls, but it would not be an easy conversion.

Mrs. Hansohn asked Mr. Howard when the Galbreath-Marshall project would be moved forward to the Buildings and Grounds Committee. Mr. Howard replied that the project was in the conceptual stage at the present time, and it would probably be four to six months before the architectural and engineering work was completed.

#### **PRESENTATION FROM THE SCHOOL DIVISION**

Dr. Cox informed the Board that he would be discussing the following three proposals: (1) The proposed addition of ten classrooms to Farmington Elementary, (2) the construction of a new elementary school, and (3) the master site plan for the renovation of the current Culpeper County High School and Culpeper Middle School campus. He said he was not asking for action at the present time, but for the Board's consideration.

Dr. Cox stated the ten-classroom addition at Farmington Elementary School was being proposed due to the growth in the County and the need for classroom space. He said there had been a provision for trailers, or learning cottages, for elementary classroom space included previously in the CIP, and there had been similar discussions regarding the lack of space that

took place prior to building the Annex at the High School. He said during the School Board's work sessions and prior to approval of the School Board's CIP that went to the Planning Commission in December, a decision was made that, in lieu of trailers for elementary space, a proposal would be included for additional classroom space at Farmington Elementary that would be built in the same manner as the Annex. He said the School System was asking that the Farmington addition be funded in this year's CIP in order to move forward with the project for completion in the fall of 2007.

Dr. Cox stated for several years, the School Board included in its planning process, the need for a new elementary school to be available for opening in 2009. He said they were currently exploring the possibility of building on School Board property located on Route 522 and Yowell Drive.

Dr. Cox discussed the issue of the site plan at the High School. He explained that the plan initially considered by the architects contemplated two high schools or the conversion of that campus to a large high school. He said there were several elements of that plan that were attractive, which included the rerouting of bus traffic behind Culpeper Middle School to separate the vehicular traffic and the bus traffic, and the renovation of the athletic fields, including lights.

Dr. Conti stated another issue that had been discussed in connection with the School's long-range CIP, and also some discussion by the School Oversight Committee, was the necessity to renovate the current Culpeper County High School in phases due to finances and operational considerations. He said he would like to have the Board's approval to develop a master plan that would take into consideration not only the renovation of the building, but the grounds, parking lots, and the fields. He said the need for a master plan was to ensure that when the work would be phased in stages and be compatible.

Dr. Cox asked Mr. Hunter Spencer, Project Manager, to provide specific information on the three proposals.

Mr. Spencer stated that the Board had received copies of a time line, which addressed the proposed projects. He said the time line was necessary for planning purposes, identifying the needed resources, and making decisions in order to achieve the final products by a specific date.

Mr. Spencer pointed out that the schedule for the classroom addition for Farmington would be tight, but he could conserve time wherever possible throughout construction by utilizing the schedule. He said he was in the process of developing the RFP for architectural services and he planned to present it to the School Board for approval on the 15<sup>th</sup> of May, after which it would be advertised for proposals. He stated the plan was to build a one-story addition of ten

classrooms of 10,000-11,000 square feet with a steel frame, steel studs and gyp board for the wall surfaces, similar to the Annex and the new high school. He noted that the ten classrooms were not meant to be kindergarten classrooms since they would be smaller to meet the size requirements for any of the other grade levels. He stated that a second serving line would be added in the kitchen to serve the additional children and additional parking area would be added to the west of the building.

Mrs. Hansohn questioned whether the additional classrooms would be smaller than kindergarten classrooms. Mr. Spencer explained that the rooms would be sized for classes one through five at approximately 800 square feet, while kindergarten space required 900 square feet per classroom.

Mr. Nixon asked whether the classrooms would be smaller because there was not enough space to build them larger or to reduce the total amount of space. Mr. Spencer replied they were trying to conserve space from a cost standpoint.

Mr. Walker expressed concern that building parking spaces on the western side of the building would further limit outdoor playground space. Mr. Spencer stated that the current playground area was located on the back end, and the additional parking would be on land between the existing building and the property owned by Otis Burke, which he believed he had access.

Mr. Walker asked whether the proposed addition would utilize the entire space where the trailers were located. Mr. Spencer stated he did not believe it would use that entire space.

Mr. Walker asked whether any of the current playground area would be lost by the new addition. Mr. Spencer replied that some of the space toward the back of the building would be used.

Mr. Walker pointed out that egress was already a difficult situation and inquired how Mr. Spencer planned to address a building with 240 additional. Mr. Spencer replied that the intent was to use the new parking lot for staff, locate the parents' drop-offs and pickups on the eastern side, and have the bus traffic at the front of the building. He agreed it was not ideal but it appeared to be the best approach for providing some additional classroom spaces on the current site and not interfere with the use of the building for the most part while construction was taking place.

Mr. Walker questioned whether the tight schedule was realistic. Mr. Spencer agreed it was a tight schedule, but he thought it could be accomplished within the time line estimate.

Mr. Walker asked whether the School Board still held the philosophy that smaller schools were better. Dr. Cox replied that nobody believed that smaller schools were not better, but they

did not think there was a better option. He said the addition to Farmington would bring it to a similar size, in both program and capacity, as the other elementary schools, except Emerald Hill.

Mr. Chase expressed concern about eliminating the parking for parents. Mr. Spencer assured him that the current parking area would be available for parents and visitors when the staff was moved into new parking spaces.

Mrs. Hansohn questioned the advisability of reducing the playground area while adding 200 additional students. Mr. Spencer stated that they planned to remove some of the current terraces and make that space available.

Mr. Nixon asked whether the same type of construction that was used for the Annex and proposed for the Farmington expansion could be used for the new elementary school and, if so, could the elementary school be constructed sooner in terms of the schedule if funds were made available. He said that would make more classroom space available sooner at a lower cost. Mr. Spencer stated the intent was to build the new elementary school in the same manner with steel framing, steel stud and sheetrock. He said that it could be built earlier than April 2009, but the School Board had adopted the schedule and he planned to move forward with developing an RFP.

Mr. Nixon stated that based on Mr. Spencer's plan, the costs could be reduced and the process accelerated. Mr. Spencer agreed that costs would be reduced in terms of planning fees, but it would depend upon the condition of the site. He noted that the site seemed to be readily adaptable to a two-level scheme, with one level entering on grade from the west side and one level entering on the lower east side. Mr. Nixon asked whether both entrances would be ground level. Mr. Spencer stated that they would be. He said with so many school designs available, he felt that selecting an architect and a design at the same time would save time and money. He noted that there was some adjoining development that would provide a second access to the school.

Mr. Aylor recalled the earlier discussion regarding the addition to the Galbreath-Marshall Building and asked whether consideration had been given to designing that space for pre-K and kindergarten, with the possibility of matching funds, and to use that facility instead of building the addition at Farmington. He said the funds allocated for the Farmington addition could then be fast-tracked to the new elementary school. Mr. Spencer stated that could be considered.

Dr. Cox stated that the School System had not had any discussion regarding the use of any additional classrooms at Galbreath-Marshall for kindergarten space, but had conversations regarding preschool space. He added that there was already a space deficit in the current elementary schools, and teachers were on carts at A. G. Richardson and Pearl Sample because

rooms used for art and music rooms had been converted to classroom space, and the addition to Farmington would provide some relief for the other schools. He reminded the Board that the schools were growing at a rate that was compounded by this year's 540 additional students and the growth rate would continue to rise. He stated that by having kindergarten students off-site was a different conversation than preschool students. He said that kindergarten was an integral part of the schools' programs, such as art, music, P.E. and other programs offered and any conversations would have to include the travel time of teachers.

Mr. Walker asked whether the present design capacity at Farmington school was 500. Mr. Spencer stated that was correct according to the Virginia Department of Education. Mr. Walker asked what the enrollment was at Farmington. Dr. Cox stated the figure was 380. Mr. Walker asked what the end program capacity would be after adding 240. Mr. Spencer replied that when the Department of Education reviewed floor plans for elementary schools, they used a numeric rating system based on use of the room and would allow 24 students per elementary classroom. He stated the State calculated nothing for music, art, the gymnasium areas, multipurpose rooms, and cafeterias, and special education was calculated at 8 per classroom. He said when a classroom was converted to a computer room or for art, music, etc., the Department of Education reviewed the capacity and subtracted those rooms. He estimated that State calculations on a ten-classroom addition would be 24 students per classroom, less any being used for other purposes, resulting in a program capacity of 20 per classroom. He said the intent was to add a 200-student addition, but 240 students could be accommodated, but that was not the intent due to the student-teacher ratio.

Mr. Nixon pointed out that less local funding would be required to build a 12-classroom addition to the Galbreath-Marshall Building, if Federal funds could be obtained, than in building the ten-classroom addition at Farmington. He said if the classrooms at Galbreath-Marshall were made similar to the classrooms at Farmington for kindergarten, they could be utilized for a short period of time and building the new elementary school could be accelerated with less money being expended overall. He agreed it would be nice to have the ten classrooms at Farmington, but the alternative would serve the purpose in the short term, and better serve the citizens in the long term.

Mrs. Hansohn agreed that further discussions should take place before moving forward. She pointed out that the 12 classrooms at Galbreath-Marshall would still be available for preschool in the long term, and using them for kindergarten in the short term would be a way to maximize the available funding and still provide for the children. She stated she did not want to take any action that would be detrimental to the children.

Dr. Cox stated he would be willing to have discussions, but he was very concerned about the time frame and in providing classroom space for the K-5 students across the School Division in the fall of 2007. Mrs. Hansohn stated that would be her concern also, but thought should be given to building an elementary school as soon as possible.

Dr. Cox said it was a benefit to the School Division in having the elementary schools similar in size because it provided equity to each of them. Mrs. Hansohn stated she understood equity, but smaller schools were better and smaller schools should not be jeopardized in order to achieve equity in the future.

Mr. Bossio expressed his concern from the financial perspective. He said the Annex cost approximately \$2.7 million for over 2,500 square feet, and the proposal was to build an approximate 10,000 square foot addition at Farmington, ten classrooms with hall space, etc., on a tight time line. He noted that \$1.8 million had been budgeted for construction plus \$400,000 in soft costs.

Mr. Spencer stated he had obtained estimates for a steel frame shell and found it would cost approximately \$220 to \$230 dollars a square foot. He stated he was comfortable with the building aspect of the project and he would stretch the dollars as far as he could.

Mr. Bossio also expressed concern regarding the problems that may be incurred when the current building was opened to make the necessary connections to the new one. Mr. Spencer stated the addition would basically be a stand-alone building, with no tie into mechanical systems, except for some electrical.

Mr. Walker asked Mr. Spencer why 20 students per classroom were being used when the State figured 24 students per classroom. Both Mr. Spencer and Dr. Cox replied that had been a School Board decision. Mr. Walker asked how much extra capacity would there be school-wide if the State criteria were used. Dr. Cox stated he did not have that calculation. Mr. Walker stated that the School System used the State standard of 24, and the State actually appropriated the funds based on 24, so four students per teacher could be added to reach a calculation. Dr. Cox said the School Board made the decision for smaller classrooms based on accomplishing its mission and the achievements gained by having lower class sizes.

Mr. Walker pointed out that the local taxpayers had paid the local share for smaller classrooms. He felt that in terms of a short-term solution, the School Board could make a decision to change the student-teacher ratio to 24:1 for an interim period and to move quickly to build the new elementary school. He said the capability was built into the existing School System to accomplish that.

Mr. Spencer stated that he received updates each month from staff regarding class sizes at each school. He noted that the pupil ratio in the kindergarten classes at Farmington was currently 23:7. He said across the board, the classroom size had exceeded the School Board's desired ratio in four of the five elementary schools with an average of 21.5.

Mr. Spencer stated that renovating the existing CCHS Campus involved using the buildings in different ways and providing changes in the overall high school experience had been discussed by the SOC. He said any renovations would need to be made over a period of time on a year-by-year basis and would involve some replacement and modernization of aging or obsolete equipment, furnishing and systems. He recalled that the SHW study had contained information on age of equipment, usefulness and replacement schedules, and an independent engineer had inventoried the equipment in all of the buildings. He stated that some upgrading and modernizing would be required of the existing finishes in the high school due to the age of the building and some remodeling of existing space would be involved to accommodate existing or anticipated program improvements or changes. He said the SHW study had projected costs for renovations and changes in the existing high school to be over \$20 million.

Mr. Spencer stated that in conversations with the SOC, it was agreed that the changes would need to be made over a period of time and a master plan would be required, and he suggested that a professional be hired to develop the master plan.

Mr. Spencer stated there were some particular needs that needed to be addressed prior to the opening of the new high school in 2008. He said it was originally planned to split the agricultural curriculum between the existing high school and new high school in order to offer the program at both places, but a value decision had been made to provide the program only at the existing high school. He said it was decided to move the ROTC program to the new high school in order to gain space to expand the Ag program to the lower level where the current ROTC program was located, and it would need to be ready prior to opening the new high school. He said a master plan would incorporate these types of interior and external improvements in a timely fashion.

Mrs. Hansohn called attention to the programs already taking place at Carver Piedmont and suggested that the School System look to that school as a resource versus duplicating the same programs in the high school.

Dr. Conti stated that the School System was not trying to duplicate programs at Carver Piedmont, but was directing students who were ready to graduate to Carver Piedmont to take advantage of those programs. He said they had to ensure that the students in the agricultural program achieved the competencies provided by licensed teachers as required by the State in

order to obtain credit. He said the degree of competency provided by Carver Piedmont was much higher, and he hoped to interest the students in taking advantage of the programs at Carver Piedmont after their graduated.

Mrs. Hansohn mentioned since the County owned the Carver Piedmont building, consideration should be given to offering a class separate from the adult class at a different time, but with the same equipment and space. She pointed out that any funds saved on renovating the current high school could be used toward a new elementary school or another middle school. Dr. Conti agreed that consideration should be given to utilizing the best possible space without duplicating programs.

Mr. Walker asked whether Mr. Spencer had an estimate on what the development of a master plan might cost. Mr. Spencer replied that he did not. Mr. Walker asked Mr. Spencer whether he found the SHW study commissioned by the Board to be helpful. Mr. Spencer stated it provided dollar estimates on some ideas and would enable each step of the renovations to be analyzed separately.

Mr. Walker stated that the reason he voted to invest in the renovations at the existing high school campus was because of the crowded conditions and the need for sports fields, parking, etc. He said he anticipated these would be in place by now and he was concerned that work had not started to alleviate those problems.

Mrs. Hansohn asked whether the playing fields at the high school could be done without waiting for a master plan. Mr. Spencer agreed that they could begin and noted that the previous study indicated utilities would not need to be relocated, but grading would be required. He said it was important to have a master plan so that work would not be duplicated.

Mr. Aylor stated he agreed with the concept of a master plan and asked who would be involved. Mr. Spencer replied, from a procurement standpoint, he thought the same firms who had been bidding on the school projects, particularly the new high school, would be submitting quotes.

Mr. Coates recessed the meeting at 12:00 noon.

Mr. Coates called the meeting back to order at 12:07 p.m.

Mr. Walker asked to speak on the issue discussed prior to the recess. He said he wanted to make it clear that he was in favor of smaller educational units and was not opposed to adding additional classroom space, but he was very much in favor that the Board utilize the citizens' dollars the best that it could while obtaining the long-term benefit the educational system deserved. He stressed that he was in favor of building the new elementary school as soon as possible to take care of the needs of the student capacity.



### **FY '07 APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION**

Mr. Bossio explained the difficulties in presenting a resolution for the FY 2007 appropriations since the State had not approved its budget. He said that the Board had the following alternatives: To appropriate the adopted budget, to appropriate last fiscal year's budget or to defer the appropriation. He said he would recommend, given the circumstances, to wait until an appropriation was received from the State before adopting the FY 2007 appropriations. He stated he did not believe the delay would harm the School Board in any way, since a contingency could be placed in the teachers' contracts with the knowledge that State funding would ultimately be received.

Mr. Chase moved that the Board postpone approving the resolution covering the FY 2007 appropriations until the State's budget had been received. Mr. Nixon seconded for discussion purposes.

Mr. Nixon suggested that the motion include a time limit of 30 days for the postponement. Mr. Chase agreed to amend the motion.

Mr. Walker pointed out that the ultimate deadline was July 1. Mr. Bossio agreed that July 1 was the deadline for State dollars, but the County could operate on local dollars from the General Fund until September or October.

Mrs. Hansohn stated that the item should be put on the agenda for June, and it should be followed month-by-month to ensure that the County had the capability to meet its obligations. Mr. Bossio assured her the item would be on the June agenda.

Mr. Rosenberger asked what the requirement was relative to supplying the School Board with a budget. Mr. Bossio stated that the requirement was for a budget, not an appropriation, but he would ask the County Attorney for confirmation.

Mr. David Maddox, County Attorney, stated the time limit for a budget was either May 1 or 30 days from the time the estimate was received from the State, whichever was later. He said the County had met all of the budget requirements, and there was no time limit on the appropriation except July 1.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

### **THE BOARD WILL CONSIDER AWARDING A CONTRACT FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENTS AND WATER AND SEWER LINE EXTENSIONS TO THE NEW HIGH SCHOOL**

Mr. Paul Howard recalled that the County was responsible for the road improvements

and water and sewer service to the new high school. He stated that an RFP was issued in January for engineering services, five companies submitted proposals, and two were selected for interviews. He said staff had concluded its evaluations, and he was recommending that a contract be awarded to Dewberry & Davis for both projects in the amount of \$323,780. He reminded the Board that \$3.9 million had been budgeted for the improvements, including the soft costs.

Mr. Nixon moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to award the contract for engineering services for water and sewer extensions and road improvements to the new high school to Dewberry & Davis in the amount of \$323,780.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Motion carried 7 to 0.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

**COMMITTEE REPORTS** – There were no Committee reports.

### **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REPORT**

Mr. Carl Sachs, Director of Economic Development, recommended that the practice of having the Board of Supervisors tour local businesses and industries be reinstituted. He suggested that one visit be scheduled each quarter, and the Mayor and Town Council be invited to participate in tours within the Town. He said he would like to begin the visits in the next quarter and, under the FOIA, the local media would be notified and invited to attend.

There were no objections.

### **AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT - APRIL 12, 2006**

Mr. Bossio reported that the Airport Advisory Committee met, and there were no action items to bring forward.

### **ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Bossio reminded the Board that the Water and Sewer Authority was scheduled to meet on Thursday, May 4, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

### **CLOSED SESSION**

Mr. Nixon moved to enter into closed session, as permitted under the following *Virginia Code* Sections, and for the following reasons:

1. Under *Virginia Code* §2.2-3711(A)(1), to consider: (a) An appointment to the Rappahannock Emergency Medical Services Council, (b) a reappointment to the Rappahannock Emergency Medical Services Council, and (c) salaries to be paid to two specific individuals.
2. Under *Virginia Code* §2.2-3711(A)(7) and (A)(30), for discussion with legal counsel and

staff to consider entering into one or more agreements with another public entity, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the County.

3. Under *Virginia Code* §2.2-3711(A)(3), (A)(7) & (A)(30), for discussion with legal counsel and staff to consider a contract proposed by a private entity which would provide to the County a specific parcel of land in the County, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the County.

4. Under *Virginia Code* §2.2-3711(A)(3), (A)(7) and (A)(30), for discussion with legal counsel and staff regarding the negotiation of the terms of a potential lease with a public body, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the County.

Seconded by Mrs. Hansohn.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Nay - Chase

Motion carried 6 to 1.

Mr. Coates recessed the meeting at 12:20 p.m. for lunch.

The Board entered into closed session at 2:15 p.m.

The Board returned to open session at 4:24 p.m.

Mr. Coates polled the members of the Board regarding the closed session held. He asked the individual Board members to certify that to the best of their knowledge, did they certify that (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements under Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the closed session motion by which the closed meeting was convened, were heard, discussed or considered by the Board in the closed session.

Mr. Coates asked that the record show that Mr. Chase did not stay for the entire closed session.

Ayes - Aylor, Walker, Coates, Nixon, Rosenberger, Hansohn

**RE: APPOINTMENT TO THE RAPPAHANNOCK EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES COUNCIL**

Mr. Nixon moved, seconded by Mr. Rosenberger, to appoint Scott Chamberlain to the Rappahannock Emergency Medical Services Council.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Absent - Chase

Motion carried 6 to 0.

**RE: REAPPOINTMENT TO THE RAPPAHANNOCK EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES COUNCIL**

Mr. Nixon moved, seconded by Mr. Aylor, to reappoint E. Thomas Williams to the Rappahannock Emergency Medical Services Council.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Absent - Chase

Motion carried 6 to 0.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mrs. Hansohn moved, second by Mr. Nixon, to adjourn at 4:26 p.m.

Mr. Coates called for voice vote.

Ayes - Aylor, Chase, Coates, Hansohn, Nixon, Rosenberger, Walker

Absent - Chase

Motion carried 6 to 0.

Peggy S. Crane, CMC  
Deputy Clerk

John F. Coates, Chairman

ATTEST:

Frank T. Bossio  
Clerk to the Board

Approved: June 6, 2005